

## **REMARKS**

### **SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE INTERVIEW**

The applicant held a telephone interview with the examiner on 07/18/2008 to discuss the finality of the current office action. In particular, the applicant asserted that the finality of the office action should be withdrawn and a new office action issued since the examiner has not yet considered all of the claim limitations. The application is not in condition for appeal because in effect the claims have not yet been examined. The applicant subsequently raised the issue with the examiner's supervisor, who recommended a second telephone interview be held after filing this response.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 USC § 103**

The examiner rejected claims 48 and 49 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Balakrishnan in view of Ito. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

It appears the examiner has overlooked significant claim limitations. In particular, the examiner is arguing that Balakrishnan suggests (in view of Ito) to copy text from a first window and paste the text into a second window. However, this is not what is recited in the claims. Claim 48 recites the following:

- set input focus on a first window;
- receive a copy command and set input focus on a second window;
- when the user selects text from the second window, perform independent of the user (i.e., automatically):
  - copy the selected text;
  - switch focus back to the first window; and
  - paste the selected text into the first window.

In contrast, Balakrishnan (in view of Ito) discloses the following:

- set input focus on a first window;
- copy text from the first window; and
- paste text into a second window.

The examiner has not addressed all of the above claim limitations, therefore the applicant requests the finality of the office action be withdrawn and the examiner issue another office action addressing all of the above claim limitations. The application is not in condition for appeal because the examiner has not yet developed the issue. The examiner should address all of the claim limitations so that if an appeal is necessary, there will be clear issue to consider on appeal.

Before the examiner issues an advisory, the applicant respectfully requests a second telephone interview with the examiner and the examiner's supervisor (Steven S. Hong).

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicant respectfully requests the examiner to withdraw the finality of the current office action and issue a new office action addressing all of the claim limitations. If it is believed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, or clarify matters with regard to its allowance, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 07/22/2008

By: /Howard H. Sheerin/  
Howard H. Sheerin  
Reg. No. 37,938

Howard H. Sheerin  
Attorney at Law  
23233 N. Pima Rd., Suite 113, PMB 174  
Scottsdale, AZ 85255  
Phone: 303-765-1689